Reply to Office action of 14 April 2004

## **REMARKS**

Paragraph 2 of the Office action requests that any previously filed information disclosure statement that has not been initialed by the Examiner be resubmitted. Applicant's record indicates that the initial information disclosure statement filed on 28 June 2001 has not been initialed by the Examiner. Accordingly, the initial information disclosure statement is submitted herewith. A copy of a return receipt postcard is also submitted herewith as evidence that the initial information disclosure statement was filed on 28 June 2001.

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 444 – 447, 449 – 451, and 453 – 471. Although the Office action listed claim 452 as currently pending, claim 452 was previously canceled by Applicant in the Second Preliminary Amendment filed 21 September 2001. New claim 476 is submitted to recover the allowable subject matter initially recited by canceled claim 452. New claim 476 depends from allowable claim 451, and thus is believed to be in condition for allowance. No new matter is added.

Claim 472 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Keeth et al., U.S. Pat. No.: 5,552,739 (hereinafter the '739 patent). Specifically with respect to claim 472, the Examiner stated:

With respect to claim 472, a device [figure 3] for an integrated circuit having a voltage supply [110 of figure 3] responsive to a voltage external [V<sub>ccx</sub> of figure 3] to the integrated circuit and generating a feedback signal [feedback loop of figure 3], said device comprising: a first circuit portion [110 of figure 3] responsive to the external voltage for producing a first output signal [output of 110 of figure 3] indicative of whether the external voltage is above a predetermined value [external is in the range of 3-5 volts]; and a second circuit portion [A1 of figure 3] responsive to said first output signal and the feedback signal for producing a first enable signal [via 76 of figure 3] to enable the voltage supply.

Claim 472 recites a first circuit portion, a second output portion, and a voltage supply. The first circuit portion produces a first output signal which is used by the second circuit portion to produce a first enable signal. The first enable signal is employed to enable the voltage supply. The first enable signal is not supplied to the first circuit portion.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has misconstrued the teachings of the '739 patent. The Examiner cites voltage source 110 of the '739 patent (figure 3) as teaching both the "voltage supply" and "first circuit portion". Thus, applying the Examiner's construction to claim 472, it follows that the first enable signal must be fed back to both the voltage source and to the first circuit portion (i.e., fed back to voltage source 110). As discussed above, the first enable signal is not supplied to the first circuit portion of the device recited in claim 472.

Appl. No. 09/893,389 Amdt. Dated: 12 July 2004

Reply to Office action of 14 April 2004

For these reasons, it is believed that claim 472 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 472 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of the '739 patent be withdrawn.

Claims 473 - 475 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 473 - 475 depend from allowable base claim 472 and thus are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 473 - 475 be withdrawn.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 444 – 447, 449 – 451, and 453 – 476 is earnestly requested. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than by allowance, he is respectfully requested to contact applicants' attorney at the phone number listed below so that additional changes to the claims may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted

Edward L. Pencoske Reg. No. 29,688

Thorp Reed & Armstrong, LLP

One Oxford Centre

301 Grant Street, 14th Floor

Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425

(412) 394-7789

Attorneys for Applicants

Dated: 12 July 2004